

REMARKS

In the Office action dated March 22, 2005, claims 1-4, 7-10, 14-18, 29, 31-34 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,734,732 issued to Cavers ("Cavers"). Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cavers. Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 5-6, 11-13, 19-28, 30 and 35 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants hereby submit a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement for consideration by the Examiner.

In view of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-36 are in condition for allowance.

1. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 7-10, 14-18, 29, 31-34 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-4, 7-10, 14-18, 29, 31-34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cavers. For a claim to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the reference must disclose each and every limitation in the claim. Applicants respectfully submit that Cavers does not disclose every element of the claimed invention.

Briefly, Cavers discloses an adaptive feedforward amplifier. (See, col. 1, lines 48-49 and col. 7, lines 63-64). The Office action states that Cavers describes a control module (CT1) using an open loop control routine (51, 30, DL1, 35, S3, 105, CT1, and 110) and a control module (CT2) using a closed loop control routine (85, CT2, 120, 55, A2, 60, C2, 75, and S6). (See, Office action, page 2, para. 3). Applicants respectfully submit that the control routine (51, 30, DL1, 35, S3, 105, CT1, and 110) and the control routine (85, CT2, 120, 55, A2, 60, C2, 75, and S6) are both associated with closed loop control routines. For example, the error signal on line

45 is passed to the controller (CT1) by lines 90 and 100 as a feedback signal for the closed loop control routine associated with the controller (CT1). (See, col. 1, lines 48 to col. 2, line 2).

Further, the Office action also describes the control module (CT1) passing control to the control module (CT2). (See, Office action, page 2, para. 3). Applicants respectfully submit that the control module (CT1) does not pass control by switching to the control module (CT2).

Applicants' claimed invention relates to methods and systems for stabilizing an amplifier. Applicants respectfully submit that regarding claims 1 and 33, Cavers does not disclose, at least, a stabilization module comprising an open loop control system and a closed loop control system. Further, regarding claims 18, 32 and 36, Cavers does not disclose, at least, modifying an input using an open loop control routine and modifying the input using a closed loop control routine.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that regarding claims 1 and 33, Cavers does not disclose, at least, an open loop control system passing control to a closed loop control system. Further, regarding claims 18 and 36, Cavers does not disclose using a first control module that uses an open loop control routine and that sends a signal to a second control module that uses a closed loop control routine. Further, regarding claim 32, Cavers does not disclose a means for receiving a first signal representative of an input signal, that uses an open loop control routine to modify a characteristic of the input signal and that passes control to a second control module, and a means for generating a signal that modifies the characteristic of the input signal using a closed loop control routine.

Applicants thus respectfully submit that, at least for these reasons, claims 1, 18, 32-33 and 36 are in condition for allowance.

Since claims 2-17, 19-31 and 34-35 depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 18, 32-33 and 36, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims also are allowable.

2. Rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cavers. For the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) to be proper, the reference must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that Cavers does not teach or suggest every claim element of the invention.

Specifically, as described above with respect to claim 1, Cavers does not teach or suggest a stabilization module comprising an open loop control system and a closed loop control system. Further, Cavers also does not teach or suggest an open loop control system passing control to a closed loop control system.

Since claim 4 depends directly from claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that this claim also is allowable.

3. Objection

Claims 5-6, 11-13, 19-28, 30 and 35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication of the allowability of these claims; however, in view of the above remarks supporting the patentability of claims 1-4, 7-10, 14-18, 29, 31-34 and 36, Applicants have elected not to rewrite these claims in independent form.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of claims 1-36. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative by telephone at the number listed below to discuss any outstanding issues.

Date: June 21, 2005

Proskauer Rose LLP
One International Place
Boston, MA 02110
Tel. No.: (617) 526-9800
Fax No.: (617) 526-9899

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'E. Saarmaa', written over a horizontal line.

Erik Saarmaa
Reg. No. 56,834
Agent for the Applicants